



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the Latin riddles that preceded them, and of the answer to be expected when this or that attribute is ascribed to the unknown *x* of the riddle. It is Professor Tupper's wide reading in the Latin riddles beginning with Symphosius and in folk-riddles, and his constant adherence to sound principles in applying this reading, that give his solutions an authority beyond that of guesses, however shrewd.

The edition is generously annotated. As the subjects of these poems, that is, the answers to the riddles, include weapons, garments, musical instruments, sacred utensils, articles of food and drink, beasts, birds, fishes, insects, trees, and plants, the editor has embraced the occasion to give ample information drawn from writings, museum objects, and manuscript illustrations of the Old English period, and from modern treatises.

At the time of publishing this edition Professor Tupper accepted the view propounded by Mr. Henry Bradley, that *Riddle 1* is not a riddle but an epic fragment. With this premise he concluded, as the result of a very minute study (pp. lxiii-lxxix) that the *Riddles*, with the exception of 36, 41, and 67, are the work of one author, a Northumbrian, not Cynewulf, and perhaps of the first half of the eighth century, this date, however, being "an inviting surmise, unsustained by proof." The argument for unity of authorship is especially well presented. The differences in language between the *Riddles* and the poems containing the runic signature of Cynewulf are declared to have little value as evidence, either singly or in combination. In the sentence on page lix, "On account of the many noteworthy differences between the speech of the problems [*Riddles*] and that of Cynewulf, he [Madert] reaches the conclusion . . . that these poems are not the work of that writer," the word "noteworthy" must be taken as a quasi-quotation from Madert, not as an indication of the editor's own opinion. The one difference from recognized Cynewulfian usage which is offered without any impugning of its merit as evidence is the occurrence, noted by Herzfeld, of a stressed short syllable in the second foot of type A, when no secondary stress precedes. Of this sixteen instances are cited (p. lx, note \*). Yet we are told (p.

lix), "The evidence of meter, language, and style certainly speaks against the theory of Cynewulfian authorship." This must now seem to the editor to have been incautious, but apart from this sentence, it would be hard to find anything of which he need repent, although in his subsequent article, already cited, he has changed his opinion completely with regard to a point fundamental to the whole question of authorship, namely, the nature and interpretation of *Riddle 1*. It is the irony of fate that this discovery should have been made too late to be incorporated in the present volume. Professor Tupper now finds in *Riddle 1* a charade *Cyn-wulf*, and also a runic acrostic in the order FNLCYWU, the runes being represented by synonyms of their names (*lāc* = *feoh* = *F*; *ðrēat* = *nȳd* = *N*; etc.). Thus Cynewulf, like Aldhelm, has announced at the beginning his authorship of the series of riddles. Professor Tupper shows that, intricate and far-fetched as the solution appears, it is no stranger than what we encounter in authentic Icelandic acrostics of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The difficulty of *Riddle 1* is thus not like that of an ordinary riddle, where any one can see the appropriateness of the answer, once it is known, but like that of a mathematical problem, in which the difficulty persists even though the result to be attained is known.

The glossary omits *ðēana* (59. 13; 88. 10), *hangellān* (45. 6), and *wīfum* (26. 1).

W. STRUNK, JR.

Cornell University.

---

*Practical Lessons in French Grammar*, by TH. COLIN and A. SÉRAFON. Boston, New York, Chicago, Sanborn & Co., 1910. 16mo., xiv + 354 pp.<sup>1</sup>

This new French grammar contains much that is commendable and evidences the authors' thorough knowledge of American class-room and college-entrance requirements. It never loses sight of the fact that French is a living language, to be spoken and written by the student, not merely to be read and translated. The texts, generally connected narratives, on which the oral and written

<sup>1</sup> This review is based on a revised and corrected edition, with the same imprint, but issued in 1911.

exercises are based, are interesting, well-chosen, and well-graded, and should give the student a most serviceable working vocabulary. The provision made for "original composition" is a valuable feature. The "facts of the language" are often presented with felicitous originality, *e. g.*, partitive expressions, p. 83; inflection of regular verbs, p. 254, etc.

In the hope that a third edition will further perfect a book which will undoubtedly find many friends, the following remarks and suggestions are offered.

In spite of the thorough revision of the chapter on pronunciation in the second edition, much remains to be added. Moreover, greater care should be exercised in the choice of examples: *musée*, *vie*, *bleue*, *joue*, etc., are unsatisfactory examples for long vowels. In spite of note 3, the lengthening of final vowels by a following silent *e* is generally considered a dialect characteristic,<sup>2</sup> and *berger* seems to have even less justification. The definition "*r . . .* [is] either trilled or uvular," makes a misleading confusion between place and manner of articulation. Each *r* can be trilled or untrilled.

Among the rules for syllabication, p. xxxiii, some statement concerning cases like *es-pèce*, *estime*, *res-te*, is imperative; otherwise, students do not understand why these *e*'s take no accent, while one is required in words like *é-change*, *rè-gne*, etc. The function of accent-marks is so important and their use is so intimately connected with the so-called irregularities of French inflection that they deserve more attention than is here accorded.

The avoiding of hiatus is given undue prominence in the chapter on euphony. One might contend that even the elision of articles is not the result of an aversion to hiatus in the language. And if, *e. g.*, the *t* in *a-t-elle* were imperatively demanded by "euphony," why not also in the case of *à elle*, *à eux*? The false point of view entails actual error in the statement (p. xxiii, 48) that adjectives like *beau*, *fou*, "have a second masculine form to be used before a vowel or an

*h*-mute." Since a knowledge of the alternation between *l* and *u* before consonants (and the peculiar use of a final *x* after *u*) would enable the students to understand not only these adjectives, but also contraction of articles, almost all irregular plurals and many irregular verb-forms, they seem entitled to it. The brief allusion (p. 25 N. B.) to the *el*, *ol* forms as "*old*," whereas they have first been designated as "*second*," can but confuse the students.

The whole treatment of the modes and tenses would be materially improved by a thorough revision. Only a few of the remarks that might be made can find a place here.

Conditional sentences are not adequately treated. They fully deserve a chapter to themselves. It is difficult to understand the necessity for the statement, p. 128, "that the subjunctive is never used in an *if*-clause," since no class can do the required reading without coming across numerous examples of pluperfect subjunctives so used. This erroneous statement is not remedied by the footnote, p. 201, "*avoir* and *être* have a literary conditional which has the same force as the imperfect subjunctive." But "*il eût fait fortune*" is not the imperfect subjunctive of *avoir*; it is the pluperfect subjunctive of *faire*. This same confusion between the tense of the auxiliary and the complete verb is found, p. 137, 126, where "when you *have* finished" is given as an example of an English *present* substituted for a French *future*. Moreover, the tendency to consider compound tenses as a subordinate variety of the simple tenses is noticeable elsewhere. On pages 144 and 145, a note assigns the uses of the imperfect to the pluperfect, and a brief remark assigns the uses of the past definite to the past anterior. The one example of the pluperfect, p. 144, "*des oiseaux qu'elles avaient pris*" cannot, however, be explained by any of the statements found there. The idea of action (or state) in continuation in the past which is fundamental and constant with the imperfect, is "accidental" with the pluperfect (cp. "*il avait tué son ennemi du premier coup*," and "*il avait dormi toute la nuit*"), and will greatly depend on the "*Aktionsart*" of the verb, and on the context. The "constant" with the pluperfect is the idea of completion prior to a past point of time. Moreover, the idea of

<sup>2</sup> See, *e. g.*, Beyer, *Französische Phonetik*, p. 104 Anm.; Michaelis and Passy, *Dictionnaire Phonétique*, p. 313 and 316 (where this peculiarity is ascribed to Swiss and Belgian pronunciation).

"duration prior to completion" sometimes conveyed by the pluperfect, is different from the idea of "progressive stage" from a past standpoint, with no thought of completion, expressed by the imperfect. They should not be confused.

In the table on p. 239, no place is provided for the French "future-to-a-past," (il dit *qu'il viendrait*) a frequent and most important tense-use, which certainly deserves as much recognition as the English "progressive" conjugation.

Finally, the remark can be made that while the general arrangement of the conjugation of verbs is one of the attractive features of the book, the absorption of *-oir* verbs by the irregular *-ir* verbs is not to be commended. Historically, it is not justifiable and, practically, the students should not be misled into considering *-oir* the equivalent of *ir*.

C. J. CIPRIANI.

Chicago.

---

*La Connaissance de la Nature et du Monde au Moyen-Age*, par CH. V. LANGLOIS. Paris, Hachette, 1911. 12mo., xxiv + 400 pp.

This volume is the third and last of a series, of which the first and second have been reviewed in these columns.<sup>1</sup> The general plan of the author is to make known, as he says in his preface to the present work, *par une méthode nouvelle*, certain special phases of medieval French history, and of the thirteenth century in particular, which the lettered public knows least about.

There are six chapters in the book, having to do respectively with these authors and subjects: Philippe de Thaon's *Lapidaire* and *Bestiaire*; the *Image du Monde*; Barthélemy l'Anglais; le *Roman de Sidrach*; Placides et Timeo and le *Livre du Trésor*. The volume closes with a bibliography of modern studies on nature phenomena in the literatures of the Middle Ages.

The method of demonstration employed by M. Langlois is not an entirely new one. The original element of his work lies in the peculiarly ingenious way he has of adapting his data, under one cover, to the needs of the scholar and the layman. There is an abridged rendering into modern French of each medieval text, which affords material, for the general reader, of even greater interest than that contained in the two volumes previously published in this series. By this means, the author makes clear to men of the present day what ideas concerning the physical world existed in the minds of thoughtful men in the Middle Ages—men who were cultivated and intelligent although unfa-

miliar with the higher researches in this realm of speculation. The point therefore of this work is not to give a history of the sciences and their development in the thirteenth century, but to pass in review those writings, in the vernacular, on natural phenomena which aimed to popularize the sciences or reproduced the common beliefs of men with reference to nature.

The author has thought it undesirable to take account of medieval compilations in Latin such as those of Neckam, Albertus Magnus, and Vincent of Beauvais, ill-suited to the general needs of the age owing to their vastness and technical character. The French adaptors or translators of less involved writings such as the *Imago Mundi* of Honorius took occasion to add to the original certain ideas and reflections of their own in conformity with those of the French readers for whom they wrote. It was French versions of this type which gave nearly all classes of men, from the time of Saint Louis up to the sixteenth century, an opportunity to learn about the world. On account of these considerations, M. Langlois has chosen for his volume the five principal French encyclopaedias mentioned above, together with the two works of Philippe de Thaon. The work of Barthélemy l'Anglais: *De proprietatibus rerum*, divided into nineteen books, although translated into French by Jehan de Corbechon only in 1372, is included in this volume on account of the prodigious vogue it enjoyed in France in the thirteenth century. The synopsis in modern French of Barthélemy, given by M. Langlois, shows, as well as any writing can, the crudity and weirdness of medieval thought when compared with the ordinary every-day knowledge in modern times of biology, physics and astronomy, and, in particular, of geography. The analysis of the *Roman de Sidrach* produces a similar effect with its strangely confused notions about ethics and theology. Almost the same thing might be said of the *Livre du Trésor*, although Brunetto is a more cautious writer and refrains from many of the absurdities incident to this class of literature.

Each chapter has a preface in which M. Langlois gives especial evidence of the technical erudition which characterizes all his work; the preface to the *Image du Monde* treats of the three redactions of this famous work and gives many important data concerning authorship and other problems of a philological character. The discussion upon the nationality of Barthélemy and the question as to who was the French author of the book of Sidrach are carefully outlined, with the various opinions of authorities quoted and fairly considered so as to give as complete a treatment of the problems as possible.

Of the six writers analyzed in the volume,

<sup>1</sup> XIX, 134-136; XXIII, 249-251.